English and French writers on the disease, it is important to keep constantly in mind, inasmuch as, in a very large number of cases, it is in vain to attempt the arrest of laryngitis by any course of treatment until the little patient is put upon a proper and well regulated diet, and subjected to the influence of a free, pure atmosphere of suitable temperature. This alone we have often known to suspend the paroxysms, which had previously been of frequent occurrence.

Although laryngismus is a disease of the period of infant life, during which the process of teething is most active, we have no reason for supposing that the latter is a very common exciting cause of it; when, however, the gum over the advancing teeth is greatly swollen, hard and red, the mouth is hot, and the child evidently suffers pain in its mouth, a careful incision of the gum is equally advisable in children labouring under laryngismus as it would be under any other circumstances.

We earnestly commend the lectures of Dr. Jacobi to the favourable consideration of the profession at large. They are replete with instruction in relation to many important points connected with infantile pathology which are not well understood by a large number of practitioners. The author has done ample justice to his subject and its literature, whether the lectures are viewed simply as presenting an exposition of the physiology of dentition and its derangements, or as a general review of the nature, seat, and causes of those diseases which are usually observed during the period of dentition. His object is evidently the attainment of correct views in respect, more especially, to the etiology of the maladies just referred to, and although he may, perchance, have ignored to too great an extent the influence of dention in their production, his teachings cannot fail to have the beneficial effect of directing the medical practitioner to a recognition of the entire want of foundation for the common opinion so long entertained by the public as well as by the profession, everywhere, that teething is usually a painful process, and one of the most usual and efficient of the predisposing and exciting causes of the maladies of infancy. An opinion not simply unsupported by facts, but one adapted to cause, on the one hand, the true etiology of many important diseases to be overlooked; and on the other hand, to lead to the adoption of a practice always useless and often mischievous.

D. F. C.

Art. XXV.—*Addresses delivered by* Dr. Burrows, Dr. Walshe, Mr. Paget, and Dr. Sharpey, *at the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, held at the Royal College of Physicians, London, in* 1862. London, 1862. 12mo. pp. 98.

The British Medical Association, it is well known, was formed several years ago by incorporating with the Provincial Medical Association the members of the medical profession in the metropolis. Its recent meeting, the first held in London, was remarkable for the large number of gentlemen who took part in its business, and for the character of the Addresses with which it was opened. These, which have been thought worthy of preservation in a separate form, are contained in the pamphlet before us.

The first of them, delivered by the President, Dr. Burrows, sets forth the grounds which have been made familiar to us in our own State Medical Societies and in the American Medical Association, and upon which the union of physicians for the diffusion of medical knowledge, and the maintenance of the honour and interests of the medical profession, are to be promoted and secured. In England, as at home, it has been found that the medical profession has profited by the existence of the Association in the development of new ardour in the pursuit of scientific discovery, in the improvement of practical medicine and surgery, and in the elevation of the professional status, while its influence upon the national legislature in favour of improved laws for the organization and government of the medical profession has been very salutary. Dr. Burrows sketches very appropriately the tendency of modern civilization to nationalize

all the agencies for intellectual, moral, and national advancement, by substituting for close corporations with exclusive privileges, institutions of a larger scope and a more catholic spirit. Fortunately, in some respects at least, this country was never afflicted by similar drags upon the advancement of the learned professions; while in France they have not existed since the national spirit of her people was fully aroused at the formation of her first republic. It is a gratifying spectacle to see the ancient institutions of science and learning in England yielding more and more to the necessity of opening the avenues of knowledge, and confessing that the gifts of genius and the fruits of scientific inquiry are to be sought quite as often beyond the limits of social and chartered orthodoxy as within them. It appears, however, that in England, as in this country, institutions are to be found which protest by their action against the more generous spirit which incites the profession, and which cling to the ancient paths with a tenacity which renders the purity of their motives suspicious. The orator admits, as has so often been confessed here, that to attempt the removal of such obstructions by legal methods would be injudicious; but he assures his hearers, in the same spirit that has animated American medical reformers, that "if the British Medical Association can, by its numbers and proceedings, carry public opinion along with it, then it has an intrinsic power, equal to any that could be granted by the legislature, and this moral power may be applied to the production of the most beneficial results."

The Address in medicine, by Dr. Walshe, is in every respect worthy of its author, and is beyond comparison the gem of the collection, whether in style, thought, or argument. Its object is stated to be an inquiry into the ultimate causes and the mechanism of the recent progress in medicine. The first of these causes, says Dr. Walshe, is an improved method in observing and recording medical facts. He shows how transitory and insufficient have been all conclusions in medicine which have had any less substantial basis, and defends from the sneers of superficial men that slow, toilsome, and ungrateful labour of collecting the materials upon which alone doctrines can securely rest. He contrasts the deductive with the inductive method, and shows that while the former is appropriate in certain departments of philosophy, it is misplaced in medicine, and has never given birth to any but a short-lived offspring, as most precocious children are who are the idols of their parents and the pests of all the world besides. "History," he remarks, "not only teaches us the absolute failure of all such systems, but shows that, so long as the deductive method prevailed, all progress must, if not solely, at least essentially, consist in the destruction of something gone before. The energies of genius must be wasted in negativing the errors of the past." He might have enforced the doctrine of his theme by those striking lines of the philosopher-poet:—

"Grau Freund ist alle Theorie,
Doch grün des Leben's goldner Baum."

On the subject of "pathological laws," Dr. Walshe has also much sound doctrine. He shows that such laws are not to be claimed as absolute, but only as formulæ expressing the actual state of positive knowledge, the results arrived at by the numerical analysis of accurately observed facts; results which may be more or less modified by the next fact which is added to the series, but which are, nevertheless, infinitely nearer the truth, than any which a different process can evolve. The author proceeds to show how completely the results obtained by this method have achieved the empire of the medical world, and reduced to mere nothingness the theoretical speculations of genius and the authority of mere names, when the one soars from clouds instead of solid earth, and the other usurps a control which is legitimate in nature alone. "No amount of past achievement in an investigator," he remarks, "no perfection of intellectual brilliancy in a teacher, no universality of belief in any particular man's endowments, no humility of 'hero worship,' will save any opinion, any creed, any statement of alleged facts from the critical revisal of the humblest and the newest worker in the field, or protect one or the other from inevitable destruction if that revisal detect a flaw."

Such a course of argument and such illustrations as Dr. Walshe uses to en-

force the leading principle of his discourse, we employed some twelve years ago in an essay on Medical Truth.[1] They had the honour of being pooh-poohed, at the time, by the leading British Medical Review; but as they had even then their advocates, and evidences of their soundness abounded on every side, we were content to await the verdict in their favour which time never fails to award to truth. We then cited the improvements in thoracic pathology due to Dr. Walshe as examples of the fruits which the numerical method of investigation had produced, and we are now doubly gratified in reading his own luminous and convincing exposition of the method itself. Its influence upon English and American medicine cannot be small when directed by so eminent a teacher; for while even truths divine are seldom heeded unless uttered by a voice potential, the dicta of authority find complacent listeners, and obtain a prompt conformity. Even now there are minds which chafe under the constraint of a method of investigation, which, as Bacon said of his own, "levels men's wits and leaves little to their superiority," and who, under the inspiration of an impetuous genius, have struck out theories which captivate the imagination and dazzle the calm and steady eye of reason herself. But these are only sparks and flashes which the ponderous chariot-wheels of truth strike out as she rides onward conquering and to conquer. They are only noisy bursts of vapour which admonish us of her progress, or, perchance, relieve the superabundant pressure which, but for them, might become dangerous to science itself.

In what Dr. Walshe says to indicate the true position of medicine among the sciences, we have, also, the satisfaction of knowing that we anticipated several of his arguments and illustrations, and set the same limits which he assigns to certainty in medicine, viz., that its truths apply to classes of facts alone, and not to individual instances. Hence, prognosis has ever been the most difficult part of medicine, the despair of the conscientious physician, and the quack's most fertile field; for the one knows that to foretell with certainty is impossible, and the other that a lucky guess will favour his fortune a thousand times more than a false prediction can injure it. But Dr. W. is not content with an affirmative vindication of the certainty of medicine; he not only rebukes the sneer which the members of other professions are apt to affect, or utter in ignorant sincerity, but he shows that the uncertainties in doctrine and practice which afflict medicine are neither greater nor more numerous than belong to every other department of human knowledge. He stigmatizes as it deserves the fact that a statistical investigation into the health of the British army, was intrusted to a captain in the service instead of a medical man. They manage these things better in France; and even among us, outer barbarians as our cousins across the water at present consider us, such an insult to the medical profession would have been impossible. He characterizes with equal plainness the attempt on the part of certain legal members of the legislature to exclude skilled medical opinion in cases of lunacy, for the reason that "the contradictions of medical experts *inter se* are so constant and so flagrant, that jurymen are likely rather to be led astray by the conflict of their opinions, than guided by the clearness of their technical knowledge." That this is a difficulty is not sought to be denied; "But the *onus probandi*, that this difficulty makes the chances of the jurymen failing to reach the right conclusion greater than it would be without such conflict of opinion, rests with those who oppose skilled testimony." And the critics of medical experts are reminded that just as great a conflict of testimony as to matters of fact of the most ordinary kind is daily to be observed, in witnesses whose intelligence and probity are irreproachable. "If the bar were logical," it is added, "they should then plead that witnesses as to matters of fact might henceforth be silenced," and that skilled opinion of every kind should be excluded from court, because engineers, and architects, and surveyors, and all other persons whatsoever, when summoned as experts, are quite as discordant in their opinions as physicians. But most of all is this discordance to be seen among lawyers themselves. The very business of their lives is to assert what others contradict, and to deny what others affirm. If it is said that they do so perfunctorily, and

[1] Elements of General Pathology, &c., Phila., 1848.

not as individuals, what must be thought of the notorious dissidence of opinions in judges upon the bench, whose very office is created to secure, if possible, the agreement of the weightest authorities? A striking example is mentioned of this antagonism in the highest court of England, where, upon an important point of law, brought there by appeal from below, the thirteen judges differed in their decision as much as it was possible; six were in favour of and six against the defendant, and the case was only decided by the casting vote of the presiding judge. "And these are the men," exclaims Dr. Walshe, "who would silence medical opinion in courts of justice, on the plea that it is not consistent!"

He further contrasts the amount of knowledge required by physicians and lawyers; the latter dealing, in the main, with what they themselves manufacture, the former with the mysteries of nature; the one having to expound the works of man, the other to interpret the works of God. But because physicians, when called into court, often disagree in the interpretation of facts, lawyers would exclude them entirely. The Lord Chancellor himself denounces the idea that any one should "have studied medicine in order to determine whether a man was or was not a lunatic, as an *absurdity!*" Again, we must say, "they manage these things better in France," and we might add, in Germany; for in both of those countries the medical expert is an officer of the law, and his investigation of judicial questions within his province is conducted under the sanction of an oath and of his official responsibility.

We cannot follow Dr. Walshe in the concluding portion of his Address, which relates to the opinion of the lay world concerning the relationship of medicine to the general march of civilization. He shows that in this respect, medicine has not been justly dealt with, and especially in regard to the ardent love of truth and the zealous pursuit of it which has distinguished the cultivators of this science. Alone, of lay historians, he says, the late Mr. Buckle has even attempted to render our science and art the justice which they may claim, although he failed in his object because his powers of mind were essentially deductive and, therefore, inapt to comprehend a science which is purely inductive. We believe that the imperfect appreciation of medicine by historians arises from several causes, but chiefly from this that it directly acts on individuals and not on masses. The bulk of history is composed of politics and war, and its chief actors are statesmen and soldiers. It is not only a modern, but a very recent, innovation to introduce into general histories an account of the intellectual elements of civilization. Even literature and art, although so generally attractive, and possessing such splendid monuments to attest and chronicle their progress, have hitherto depended chiefly upon special histories for a record; and we cannot, therefore, complain that the share which the medical profession has had in civilizing mankind should have been usually overlooked by the historians of national advancement. Henceforth, the creative and preservative rather than the destructive powers will demand the chief attention of writers who propose to chronicle the development of national greatness, and among them it will be impossible to neglect the influence of medicine in all its branches, as one of the chief agencies employed to protect, perpetuate, and strengthen society.

Mr. Paget's Address on the Management of Patients after Surgical Operations has all the characteristics which eminently distinguish the works of English Surgeons, and which were so prominent in those of Sir Astley Cooper, and Sir B. Brodie. They may be comprised in two words, common sense. This national trait is one more apt to be displayed in surgery than in medicine; that is to say in material and mechanical procedures which are open to the senses in their operation and results, and rather than in the management of remedies, whose mode of action is doubtful, and is rendered doubly uncertain by the obscurity of the internal condition they are intended to cure. Here the faculties required are more generally the rational as distinguished from the instinctive; the questions to be solved often demand the highest powers of ratiociuation for their solution. Doubtless, Mr. Paget is fully able to solve successfully the most intricate of these; but in the present instance he has confined himself almost exclusively to common and practical topics. While he urges the propriety of favouring union of wounds by the first intention, whenever the appropriate conditions for it exist, he dissuades from persisting too pertinaciously in the attempt, lest ery-

sipelas, purulent absorption, &c., may be favoured. Repose and cleanliness he aptly terms the two essentials of cure, but next to these is diet. Equally remote from incendiary methods and starvation plans, he counsels nutritious and varied food, according to the patient's taste and habits, and particularly inveighs against "the monotomy of mutton." It is a judicious remark, that we are too apt to consider reaction after shock as a mark of disease, and as requiring a lowering treatment; whereas, he views this process as a proof of power in the constitution, and, therefore, not to be unduly interfered with. He does not, however, fail to speak of a reaction whose very violence depends upon weakness from anæmia, nervousness, exhaustion, &c., and which must be treated with stimulants, including opium, until the shock is passed. The mortality after operations appears to Mr. Paget to be very indeterminate, or rather undetermined, and particularly because care enough is not taken to discriminate between deaths caused by operations and those which follow operations and occur independently of them or in spite of them. By this way of reckoning the aggregate of deaths set to the account of operations would be very materially reduced; but if it could be honestly determined the interests of science and art would both be promoted. Mr. Paget lauds anæsthetics, and thinks that chloroform is unjustly charged with deaths which should be attributed to shock, even "after operations of no great severity." Unhappily the deaths from this agent are numerous in which no shock existed save that which the anæsthetic itself produced. He next, speaks of phlebitis, inflamed lymphatics, erysipelas, pyæmia, putrid-infection, and tetanus, as influencing the result of operations. These affections depend upon the condition and actual morbid proclivities of the patients who are submitted to surgical operations, and their development is determined by the shock or other conditions of the operations performed. In reference to rigors which so generally usher in the secondary consequences of operations, he suggests that their explanation, which is acknowledged to be very difficult, may be sought in their analogy to convulsive affections. In support of this opinion he cites several cases in which epileptiform convulsions took the place of chill, and refers to the frequency with which such attacks usher in febrile affections, especially in children. But however caused, their origin, he maintains, is constitutional, and dependent, along with the conditions which they introduce, upon a morbid state of the blood and tissues; and he notices several among the forms and grades of traumatic pyæmia, some of which are rapidly fatal, with phenomena indicating a rapid and thorough disorganization of the circulating fluids, and others present various degrees of gravity from the severest to the most transient and slight. He very properly classes them with the true eruptive fevers, as blood diseases. As for the remedies for these fatal and troublesome affections, he acknowledges that although quinine will sometimes cut short the attack, he finds only one thing that he can call remedial for the whole disease, pyæmia, and that is, a profuse supply of fresh air.

The Address in Physiology, by Dr. Sharpey, contains a review of the leading features and incidents which have marked the progress of the science in recent times. The great benefits that have arisen from the establishment of schools of physiology are pointed out, especially as these institutions are managed in Germany. In this connection the lecturer felt obliged to descend to an argument addressed to the well-meaning persons who indulge in "indignant but misdirected declamation against experiments upon animals." This reminds us of a similar condescension upon the part of several eminent writers in defending the use of anæsthetics against the cavils of those who could not bear to see parturition deprived of its pangs, lest the fulfilment of the prophetic curse on Mother Eve should be hindered of its accomplishment. For such Pecksniffian objectors the most appropriate argument is contempt. We need not follow Dr. Sharpey in his exposition of the value of microscopical investigations, and of numerical determination in physiology, nor in his sketch of the progress of physiological chemistry. The physiology of the nervous system; that of reproduction; the recent advances in histology; and the prevailing views of the forces of the living organism, are briefly considered, and some of the more important of recent acquisitions to positive knowledge are clearly presented. We are struck, however, with the absence of all allusion to certain names, discoveries, and views, which we suspect that his audience were prepared to hear mentioned. A. S.